DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 023 EA 017 646

AUTHOR Lake, Sara
TITLE Changing School Demographics: The New Baby Boom.
INSTITUTION San Mateo County Office of Education, Redwood City, CA. SMERC Information Center.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Demand; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment Trends; *School Demography; School Statistics; *Sociocultural Patterns; Teacher Distribution; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Shortage; *Teacher Supply and Demand; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Paby Boom; California (San Mateo County)

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the demographic and socioeconomic effects on schools of the "new baby boom," consisting of school-age children of the original "baby boomers." The effects of this second-generation demographic trend include a higher proportion of minority students (since the decline in marriage and birth rates among baby boomers reaching adulthood was limited to the white middle class), and a current rise in elementary enrollment accompanied by a continuing decline in secondary enrollment. The rising demand for elementary school teachers, coupled with the rise in more lucrative career options (especially for women), is leading to a teacher shortage. Yet faced with a declining interest in teaching as a career, many schools of education in the 1970's fought to keep their enrollments up by virtually abandoning entrance requirements. Steps to remedy this situation include raising standards and limiting teacher supply (to raise teachers' status and salaries) or, conversely, offering incentives to attract more highly qualified candidates to the profession. The effects of these demographic phenomena on San Mateo County (California) are next described in detail. The paper concludes that public schools can continue to grow only by diversifying to other age markets, such as adult education. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jean Wolbrook

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CHANGING SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS: THE NEW BABY BOOM

by

Sara Lake
Information Dissemination Specialist
SMERC Information Center
San Mateo County Office of Education

April 1985

EA 017 646

Copyright© 1985 by the San Mateo County Office of Education. Permission is granted to educators to duplicate small portions of this work for their own use but not for sale, provided that proper credit is given.

SMERC Information Center, San Mateo County Office of Education
333 Main Street, Redwood City, CA 94063 (415) 363-5450

CHANGING SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS: THE NEW BABY BOOM

Of Baby Booms Past and Present

Like baby food makers and nursing homes, the public schools serve an age-specific population and thus are at the mercy of demographic trends. For the last 40 years in particular, the schools have been buffetted so hard by the child-bearing whims of the American public that it's not surprising if we feel rather dizzy.

It began in 1946--exactly 9 months after V-J day[1]--the incredible phenomenon of the Post War Baby Boom. Everyone expects a short Baby Boom when soldiers come home from war, but no one expected this. This Baby Boom lasted 19 years, ending in 1964. Peaking in 1957, it produced over 76 million Americans--one-third of our population today.[2]

For two centuries U. S. and world birth rates have been declining steadily. They still are. The only exception to this trend had been the Postwar Baby Boom.[3] It created a bulge in the population curve so huge that it is often referred to as "the pig in the python." And to continue the metaphor, the Baby Boom has created social indigestion wherever it has gone. First maternity wards, then schools, became overcrowded. Then the Woodstock generation garnered front page publicity. When the first Baby Boomers tried to settle down in the mid-1970s, a housing crunch occurred and prices skyrocketed. Today some Boomers are beginning to worry about middle-age spread, so we are having a fitness craze. It is not too difficult to predict that geriatric medicine will soon be a growth industry.

Schools boomed through the 1950s and 1960s. Elementary enrollment peaked around 1969; secondary enrollment about 1976.[4] Then decline set in. We all know what the last decade has brought to the schools--closings, retrenchment, teacher layoffs, declining salaries.

Had the Baby Boomers emulated their parents by marrying early and having lots of babies quickly, the schools might have experienced only a minor decline, if any. After all, the oldest Boomers were in their mid-twenties when their youngest siblings entered first grade. But the Woodstock Nation of Baby Boomers refused to follow the parental program. The sheer number of young people helped create a jobs and housing crunch that made planning for the future and for children more difficult, social change offered alternate career opportunities for women, inflation brought more wives into the job market. Baby Boomers marry later, have children later, and have fewer of them. From 1972 through 1980, the U.S. fertility rate remained <u>well</u> below "replacement level."[5] But with the entire Baby Boom generation today in its prime child-bearing years (21 to 39), there are simply so many potential mothers (roughly 40 million, counting <u>native born</u> women only) that there will be lots of babies, even at a very low birth rate.

But because of the low birth rate, this new Baby Boom will be much smaller. Its peak year, projected as 1988, should see 3.9 million babies born--a high figure today but one that was surpassed for 13 straight years in the original Baby Boom.[6] Yet we can expect about a 21% rise in school enrollments by 1995.[7] The first wave is just now hitting the schools. In California, Grade 1 enrollment was up 4.5% in the 1983-84 school year, even while Grade 6 enrollment dropped 5.9%.[8]

The new Baby Boom will not only be smaller than the old, it will have an entirely different character and dispersion. The original Boom was a universal phenomenon--all American regions, groups, and social classes contributed. But that changed in the 1970s. Harold Hodgkinson, who has written a number of monographs on this subject, found that the "Baby Bust" of that period was mainly a white, and perhaps middle class, phenomenon. Birth rates for minority groups did not decline.[9] This means that our school population is becoming increasingly minority. By 1982 the minority population in California's public schools already stood at 45.9%, the fifth highest ratio in the nation.[10] Hispanics are projected to be the second largest population group in the nation by 2020. They and the Asian-Pacific groups are adding to the ethnic mix.[11] Along with differing cultures and values there is the issue of language to consider. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) estimated from the 1980 census that about 10% of the school-age children in this country already reside in non-English-speaking homes. One-half of these children live in only 3 states: California, Texas, and New York.[12]

This growing ethnicity may impact school-community relations as well as classroom activities. We may have to consider not only how to change the schools to meet the needs of these new students, but also whether an aging white population will willingly support public schools numerically dominated by minority youth.[13]

The present Baby Boom, unlike its "universal" predecessor, will be highly localized. Like the national economy, it is shifting toward the sun. In those bleak years of declining enrollment, 1970 to 1982, nine Sun Belt states, including Nevada, Utah, Arizona, Texas, and Florida, actually gained in school enrollment, due both to in-migration and births. The

greatest enrollment declines occurred, and will continue to occur, in the Frost Belt states of the Northeast.[14] Regional distinctions will be even finer than this, affecting even neighboring school districts differently, as will be noted in the segment of this paper that concerns San Mateo County.

To get down to numbers, the elementary school population curve (ages 5-9) bottomed out in 1982 and is now on the rise. The middle school age cohort (10-13 years) will decline until 1986 and then begin to rise. The bad news is for the high school level, for its population cohort (ages 14-17) will not bottom out until 1990.[15] High school enrollment will decline 10% more before 1992.[16]

The rest of this decade could be very difficult for secondary schools. The national reform reports are demanding more years of math, science, English, and social studies in high school, not to mention foreign language and computer literacy. How can schools add new courses when enrollment is declining? Another consideration is that these future cohorts of teenagers and young adults will be smaller; they will face far less competition for entry level jobs. Will the job market become so attractive that more students will decide to skip college? Might others even be tempted to drop out of high school?[17] In California, the graduation rate dropped over 10%--to 69%--between 1972 and 1982.[18] It could go even lower if a substantial number of young people choose jobs over school, adding to the decline of the high schools.

New Teachers: Demand and Supply

One of the obvious and immediate ramifications of a rising elementary population is the need for more teachers. This need is compounded by demands for smaller class sizes, rising academic requirements, the

retirement of older teachers, and the burn-out of younger ones who leave the profession.

The number of public school teachers began to decline after 1977, although the number of private school teachers has remained constant. But by 1992, the NCES predicts that the teaching force will rise to an all-time high of 2.62 million. Unfortunately for secondary school teachers, this rise will be entirely due to the demand for new elementary teachers.[19] The Labor Department predicts that through this decade (to 1990) there will be a demand for 251,000 more elementary teachers. It will be the eleventh highest demand occupation on the Department's list and the highest, other than nursing, requiring college. (The higher demand occupations are secretary, janitor, sales clerk, etc.) However, on the same list, secondary teachers rank third from the bottom in declining occupations--losing 173,000 positions. Worse figures are posted only for farmers and farm laborers.[20]

So elementary education is again a profession in demand. In the past decade, the schools of education have turned out more than enough new teachers to meet our needs; but their ability to do that now is less sure. A recent Rand study predicts that in four years the supply of teachers will meet only 80% of the demand.[21] Where have all the prospective teachers gone? Good little capitalists that they are, college students picked up the news of the teacher glut of the early 1970s and chose to major elsewhere, with better chances for employment. The enrollment in schools of education has dropped sharply, even though the number of schools actually grew during the 1970s.[22] From 1972 to 1982, for example, the number of elementary education graduates at California State University Long Beach dropped by two thirds, while the number of secondary education graduates dropped by three quarters.[23] Nationwide, between 1970 and 1982,

the annual number of teacher graduates halved, and went from 34% of all that year's college graduates to 15%.[24] In 1982, less than 5% of college freshman surveyed expressed an interest in teaching as a career, compared to nearly 20% in 1970.[25] Education's traditionally captive labor pool--women and minorities--have won good opportunities in other professions. Add to this the fact that the traditional college age group (18 to 24 years old) will itself decline 16% in size over the next decade[26] and it does indeed seem that we will come up short on fledgling teachers out of college.

Faced with declining interest in teaching as a career, many schools of education in the 1970s fought to keep their enrollments up by virtually abandoning entrance requirements, accepting 9 out of 10 applicants.[27] Dr. Feistritzer's recent national survey indicates that the average grade point average (GPA) required for admission to a school of education is 2.29, little better than a C.[28] From this phenomenon we can trace some of the current concern over teacher competence and test scores. W. Timothy Weaver of Boston University also blames it for another of teaching's major ills. In fighting for their own survival through slackening admissions standards, he argues, the schools of education not only turned out less competent teachers but also an oversupply of teachers in a declining market, which drastically reduced teacher wages and made the profession even less attractive. Up to 1970, he claims, teacher salaries rose in relation to other occupations.[29] Since 1970, the Rand study reports, teacher salaries have declined 15% in relation to salaries of other college graduates.[30]

One suggestion then for restoring the teaching profession is to restrict entrance to and raise standards in the schools of education, thus limiting the supply of new teachers and raising their quality. This tactic

has been used by other professions, such as medicine, and it is seen as a way to raise teachers' status and salaries.[31]

Several new programs are under way to improve the teacher education curriculum, mainly to emphasize academics and internships, while limiting the traditional "methods" courses. Several such efforts are described in the September 24, 1984, issue of Newsweek. The same article reports that eighteen states now require new teachers to pass competency tests and thirty more are considering doing so.[32] While most can approve of efforts to raise standards, these competency tests may threaten the composition of the teaching force. A study of ten states, including California, that are using teacher competency exams shows an alarmingly high failure rate among minority teachers. In California 76% of white teacher candidates passed, but only 67% of Native American candidates, 50% of Asian candidates, 38% of Hispanics, and 26% of Blacks. This ten-state study predicts that unless this situation changes, within a decade the percentage of minority teachers could be more than halved--to less than 5% of the teaching force.[33] And this at a time when the minority student population will be rising.

Instead of limiting the supply of teachers in order to raise quality and salaries in the long run, others prefer to have more new teachers now. Every recommendation of the national reform reports to attract new teachers is being tried somewhere. Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, is offering "forgiveness" college loans to top-rate high school students who agree to teach. The program even includes salary supplementation during the first two years of teaching.[34] The University of Massachusetts at Amherst has developed an industry partnership for training math/science teachers.[35] Houston, Texas, is recruiting even earlier, through a magnet high school for prospective teachers. The students take special courses,

are paid as teacher aides, and are offered financial assistance in college.[36]

Apparently these "attraction" techniques are beginning to work in raising the numbers and quality of the prospective teachers in our schools of education. Stanford reports that its fall, 1984, STEP (Stanford Teacher Education Program) class was nearly twice as large as the fall, 1980, class and with significantly higher Graduate Record Exam scores. A Ball State University survey found 1984's freshman class to be significantly more interested in teaching than previous classes have been.[37]

Others are choosing to make an end-run around the schools of education in the search for more teachers. Teacher Intern Programs like California's, which allow holders of bachelors degrees to earn their credentials through supervised teaching practice and minimal education courses, are springing up around the country. Pennsylvania has had such a program for 10 years to bring private industry professionals into teaching. Los Angeles, with 1,200 teaching vacancies, is hiring interns and paying for their training.[38] New York City, in need of 4,000 teachers, reports a "staggering" response to its alternate certification program.[39]

Those <u>really</u> desperate for teachers might emulate the Georgia State Department of Education, which has a program for importing math teachers from Germany, where there is a surplus.[42]

California is facing some teacher shortages, as the Los Angeles figure in the previous paragraph indicates. A 1984 <u>EDCAL</u> survey of a sample of California districts (excluding the 6 largest) found the highest demand for K-3 teachers; second, bilingual; third, grades 4-6; and fourth, math. Lowest demands were found for foreign language, government, and civics teachers.[41] The California State Department of Education estimates a need for 60,000 elementary teachers in the coming decade.[42]

The true extent of the national teacher shortage, particularly the much-discussed math/science teacher shortage, may not be ascertainable. A Government Accounting Office (GAO) report questioned the seriousness of the shortage, saying that the main data supporting it are simply opinions of personnel officers. It also notes that high school enrollments are declining and that many districts already meet the new higher academic standards. These factors will cut the projected demand for math and science teachers considerably. This lower demand may be fillable through the retraining of existing teachers and/or through new candidates drawn to the field by the news of a labor shortage.[43]

Another unknown is the pool of currently unemployed teachers, who never found teaching jobs or who were laid off in the 1970s. It is impossible to guess how many of these already-trained professionals may be drawn back by the news of job openings.[44]

So the national teacher supply and demand picture is mixed. Like the new Baby Boom and the Frost Belt to Sun Belt economic shift, the job market for teachers will be very regionalized.[45] In the next few years the prospects for elementary teachers are good; for secondary school teachers they are dismal, due to declining secondary enrollments. But those declining enrollments should ease any teacher shortages districts might encounter in trying to raise course requirements for high school graduation. The multitude of efforts to improve the quality of teacher education, recruit new college students, and fill the gaps with teacher interns may pay off. A trend to watch is the failure rate of minorities on teacher competency tests, which might screen too many minority teachers from the profession.

The Situation in San Mateo County, California

Declining enrollment devastated San Mateo County between 1970 and 1984, when it lost 40% of its elementary enrollment. Secondary enrollment will decline that much by 1990.[46] (The national average for enrollment decline in the 1970s was 14%.[47]) Private schools in the County have not suffered like this; during this period they have gained 31% in enrollment. They now house 17% of the county's students.[48]

Our public school enrollment drop has slowed, but new students are still being bled away. Of the County babies born in 1978, only 70% came to enroll in our public kindergartens in 1983. The rest had apparently left the county or gone to private schools. Those 5700 kindergarteners did not replace the 6200 seniors who graduated that year.[49] County kindergarten classes have failed to replace senior classes since 1971, but the gap is narrowing.[50]

Does this narrowing gap herald the beginning of a County Baby Boom that will again fill our classrooms? It is highly unlikely. As noted earlier, today's Baby Boom is highly regionalized. Older, established suburbs like San Mateo County are definitely at a disadvantage. Young families cannot afford our high housing prices. Just because we have mothballed schools doesn't mean they are in the right place to serve the new Baby Boom, which will probably live in newer, less expensive areas of the East and South Bay. This phenomenon has already been seen elsewhere around the nation. A Los Angeles Times article of 1982 reports that the Los Angeles Unified School District was closing schools in the West Valley suburbs while elsewhere in the city it was running 94 schools on a year-round schedule due to overcrowding.[51]

Yet several San Mateo County districts have shown modest enrollment increases. In 1983-84, according to California Basic Educational Database Systems (CBEDS) figures, Bayshore Elementary, Brisbane Elementary, Cabrillo Unified, Ravenswood Elementary, and Woodside Elementary were all up in enrollment. La Honda-Pescadero Unified stayed stable.[52] San Mateo Union High School District even reported a gain of 162 students in the fall of 1984, which they credit largely to private school transfers.[53]

A hopeful sign for increased enrollment may be found in the county's growing minority population. For example, a recent San Francisco Examiner article reveals that San Mateo County's Filipino population has grown 600% since 1970. Twenty percent of Daly City is now Filipino.[54] Minority group birth rates remain high; the question is: how many can fit themselves into the county's limited housing market?

And despite this growing minority population, county residents remain overwhelmingly white and well-to-do--the very people responsible for the "Baby Bust" of the 1970s. The 1980 census shows San Mateo County residents to be 79.2% white, 77.6% English-only speaking, and 81.9% natives of the United States.[55] We had the second highest individual median income in the state in 1983, even beating out Marin County.[56]

That census also shows that we have become a relatively childless county: 53% of San Mateans live in households without children, while another 33% live with only one or two children.[57] Recent estimates by Pacific Gas and Electric Company forecasters indicate that children are likely to remain relatively scarce: they think that, due to the limited available land, future housing growth will be mainly in rentals and condominiums,[58] which favor singles, couples, and only the smallest of families.

So, if a real Baby Boom is not in our County's future, will the county's job market for teachers continue to decline? Probably not, due to another condition which distinguishes San Mateo County from the national picture. Nationwide, the average teacher age is about 40,[59] but it is far higher here. In Sequoia Union High School District the average teacher age is over 57,[60] in Jefferson Elementary District it is around 55.[61] Clearly retirements will be a significant factor in our job market, even in the secondary teacher market which is so heavily depressed nationwide. Even though salaries for beginning teachers are rising these days, they will still cost the districts considerably less than those of the top-of-scale retirees. With our attractive living environment, many nearby education schools, and the 2000 teachers we lost in the last decade[62] (whose location and possible desire to return is an unknown factor), San Mateo County school districts should have little trouble filling those job openings created by retirements in the coming years.

Thus the tremendous decline experienced by San Mateo County schools in the 1970s seems to be over, but we should not count now on a vigorous upswing--the new Baby Boom will largely pass us by. Even modest growth will be severely localized--probably around growing minority neighborhoods. There will be population shifts between and sometimes within districts but, except where school closings inflate percentages of change, demographic shifts are occurring at a modest level. For example, CBEDS figures for 1982/83 to 1983/84 show Bayshore Elementary District to have the highest growth rate (6.12%) of County school districts, with Ravenswood Elementary District coming in second at 5.94%. Yet Bayshore's real growth consisted of 24 more students; while substantially-larger Ravenswood added 174 children.[63]

The End of Growth

America's public schools have been growing all through their history. They spent most of that time expanding service to new groups of young people until, in recent decades, they have at least theoretically accomplished the unprecedented national goal of universal elementary and secondary education. Excepting, of course, high school dropouts and the increasing numbers of private school students, there are essentially no more unserved children available to the public schools. Other than working to lower the dropout rate and to hold off the private schools, they can only grow if the market itself (the number of children) grows, as it did so spectacularly during the years of the Post War Baby Boom. But starting the 1970s, American parents began to turn off the new baby tap and, in consequence, many schools dried up. It is a lesson on how dependent schools are on demographic cycles and the parenting plans of American adults.

Of course, another Baby Boom of Post War size could happen--demographers certainly failed to predict the last one and they could fail again. But we can also choose to look at the Post War Baby Boom as an historical accident--a once-in-two-centuries demographic aberration that has affected America's schools for almost 40 years and whose smaller, lighter echo will have some impact, in some places, for several more years to come. In this light, the Baby Boom becomes a rollercoaster ride which the schools can soon get off, even if the rest of society has to stay on for the full lifetime of the the Baby Boom generation. Getting off the ride, some educators may miss the heights to which the schools climbed in the 1950s, but who will feel sorry to escape the depths of the 1970s?

But the public schools could continue to grow, if they chose to, by taking a lesson from other age-focused industries and diversifying to other age markets. Gerber Foods proudly announced in the 1950s, "Babies are our business, our only business," but since the Baby Bust, it has begun marketing its soft foods to senior citizens. Clearasil, scourge of teenage pimples in the 1950s and 1960s, now sells adult skin care products.

The schools could broaden their traditional market (ages 5-17) either down or up. Preschool education grew 27% from 1970 to 1982, despite an 8% decline in that age cohort. Thanks to the new Baby Boom, working mothers, and our realization of the importance of early education, preschool education is projected to grow another 28%--to 7 million students--by 1992.[64]

Moving up the market, adult education is also growing rapidly, perhaps 4% per year for a predicated growth of 35% in the coming decade--a decade in which high schools will decline by 10% and colleges by 4%.[65] The need for adult retraining can also be seen in the projected 46% growth in demand for vocational education instructors through 1995.[66]

Of course, in some school districts around the nation, the new Baby Boom may seem like a replay of the 1950s as they scramble to hire teachers and build schools. But those districts are not likely to be in San Mateo County, California. Here, we likely face a quieter time of fairly level enrollment, unless we choose to continue our past growth through expansion to new age groups.

REFERENCES

[1]Landon Y. Jones, Great Expectations: America and the Baby Boom Generation (New York: Ballantine Books, 1980) p. 10.

[2]Jones, p. 2.

[3]Jones, p. 2.

[4]Edward P. Caffarella, "How Will the Baby Boomette Effect School Enrollments?" School Business Affairs, January 1984, p. 14.

[5]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1984, 10th edition (Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents, 1983), p. 63, Table No. 84.

[6]Caffarella, p. 14.

[7]"Implications of Current School-Age Population Projections: ERS Staff Report," ERS Spectrum, Spring 1983, p. 14.

[8]"State Enrollment Figures Show Increase in 1st Grade," Education California (EDCAL), September 3, 1984, p. 6.

[9]Harold L. Hodgkinson, Guess Who's Coming to College: Your Students in 1990 (1983), ERIC Document ED 234 882, p. 1.

[10]"State Education Statistics, 1972 and 1982," How to Evaluate Educational Programs, February 1984, p. 7.

[11]"As the Student Population Changes, So Must Your Schools," Executive Educator, February 1985, p. 4.

[12]Valena White Plisko, "Trends in Schooling," Principal, September 1984, p. 59.

[13]"As the Student Population Changes. . ." p. 4.

[14]Plisko, pp. 60-61.

[15]"Implications of Current School-Age Population. . ." p. 11.

[16]Peter Francese, "Adult Ed Growing", San Francisco Examiner, September 19, 1984, p. zCC12.

[17]Hodgkinson, p.2.

[18]"State Education Statistics, 1972 and 1982," p. 7.

[19]Plisko, p. 61.

[20]"Where New Jobs Will Be in the 1980s," U.S. News and World Report, February 7, 1983, p. 73.

[21]Dennis A. Williams and Others, "Why Teachers Fail," Newsweek, September 24, 1984, p. 64.

[22]C. Emily Feistritzer, The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification (Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Information, 1984), p. 55.

[23]David G. Savage, "Baby Boom Echo: Enrollments in Schools Rise Again," Los Angeles Times, September 28, 1982, p. 207.

[24]"Will You Be Ready for a Teacher Shortage in 1988?" Executive Educator, February 1985, p. 8.

[25]Williams and Others, p. 64.

[26]Charles T. Kerchner, Flood Tides and Aging Swimmers: An Exploration into the Supply and Demand for Teachers (1983), ERIC Document ED 240 084, p. 3.

[27]W. Timothy Weaver, "Solving the Problem of Teacher Quality, Part I," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, p. 109.

[28]Feistritzer, pp. 10-11.

[29]Weaver, pp. 111-112.

[30]"Immediate Overhaul of Teaching Profession Urged in New Rand Study," Department of Education Weekly, August 20, 1984, p. 7.

[31]Weaver, pp. 113-114.

[32]Williams and Others, pp. 66-68.

[33]"State Competency Tests Depleting Number of Minority Teachers," Report on Educational Research, December 19, 1984, p. 3.

[34]Williams and Others, p. 66.

[35]Richard Clark and Others, "Recruiting Talent into Public School Teaching: An Analysis from One Successful Pilot Program," Journal of Teacher Education, November-December 1984, pp. 2-4.

[36]Marilee C. Rist, "Here's How to Get Faculty Forces Where You Need Them," Executive Educator, October 1984, p. 37.

[37]"Market Forces Might End the Teacher Crunch," American School Board Journal, October 1984, p. 12.

[38]Rist, pp. 27,34.

[39]Williams and Others, p. 66.

[40]Rist, p. 25.

[41]"Demand for Elementary Teachers Still Growing," Education California (EDCAL), June 25, 1984, p. 1.

[42]John Horgan, "Experienced Teachers, Lower Enrollments Pinch Budgets," San Mateo Times, March 29, 1984, p. A5.

[43]Rist, p. 26.

[44]Kerchner, p. 25.

[45]Anne Jurmu Arnold, "Teachers on the Move: In and Out of the Job Market," Learning, March 1983, pp. 24-27.

[46]"San Mateo County Schools Enrollment Trends," Education Update (San Mateo County Office of Education), February 1985, p. 1.

[47]Plisko, p. 61.

[48]John Horgan, "Enrollment Slide Eases in County," San Mateo Times, January 13, 1984, p. D1.

[49]"Diaper Derby Update," San Mateo Times, January 25, 1984, p. B7.

[50]John Horgan, "Entry Level Enrollment on the Rise," San Mateo Times, August 11, 1983, p. 10.

[51]Savage, p. 207.

[52]Enrollment Increases or Decreases by School for San Mateo County 1982/83 and 1983/84 (Sacramento, CA: California Basic Educational Database Systems (CBEDS), 1984 (Computer printout supplied by Charles C. Metzger, Consultant, State of California, Department of Education, Education Data Management System, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 322-7373)

[53]John Horgan, "Surprise! Enrollment Figures Rise," San Mateo Times, September 21, 1984, p. A1.

[54]Walt Gibbs, "Filipinos the 'Sleeping Giants' of Peninsula Politics," San Francisco Examiner, October 19, 1984, p. B1.

[55]George Golding, "Census Bureau Knows Everything About You," San Mateo Times, May 14, 1984, p. D1.

[56]"County Ranks Second in Median Income," San Mateo Times, March 20, 1984, p. D1.

[57]Golding, p. D1.

[58]John Hubbard, "Bay Area Jobs Forecast: A Cooling Trend," San Mateo Times, November 28, 1983, p. C1.

[59]Kerchner, p. 13.

[60]Dave Madden, "Bill Leaves Administrators Uneasy," San Mateo Times, September 15, 1983, p. 41.

[61]Horgan, "Experienced Teachers, Lower Enrollments. . ." p. A5.

[62]Horgan, "Experienced Teachers, Lower Enrollments. . ." p. A5.

[63]Enrollment Increases or Decreases by School for San Mateo County (see note 52).

[64]Plisko, p. 60.

[65]Franchese, p. zCC12.

[66]"Half a Million More Kindergarten and Elementary Teachers Needed by 1995," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1984, p. 508.

These and other resources on changing school demographics are available from the SMERC Information Center at (415) 363-5488.

This paper is intended as an unbiased review of the literature and does not reflect positions or opinions of the San Mateo County Office of Education.

The SMERC Information Center (San Mateo Educational Resources Center) is a department within the Educational Support and Planning Division of the San Mateo County (California) Office of Education. A pioneer in the field of educational information services since 1967, SMERC meets the needs of practitioners by providing online access to ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) and a rich collection of additional materials of particular relevance to educators. In addition to serving more than thirty agencies throughout California, the SMERC Information Center reaches subscribing agencies in Arizona, Washington, Oregon, Florida, Hawaii and the U. S. Virgin Islands.

Sara Lake came to the SMERC Information Center in 1972 after obtaining a degree in library science from the University of California at Berkeley. Her duties include online literature searching, marketing and promotion, and the creation of all of SMERC's publications: NewsNotes, SMERC Alert, and, in cooperation with the Association of California School Administrators, ERIC Highlights. She is the author of The Educator's Digest of Reform.